DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 082 635 HE 004 661

AUTHOR	Creager, John A.
TITLE	Selected Policies and Practices in Higher Education.
INSTITUTION	American Council on Education, Washington, D.C. Office of Research.
REPORT NO	ACE-RR-Vol-8-No-4
PUB DATE	Sep 73
NOTE	36p.
AVAILABLE FROM	Publications Division, American Council on Education, One Dupont Circle, Washington, D.C. 20036 (Vol. 8, No. 4, $3.00)
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS	College Credits; Colleges; Counseling; Discipline; *Educational Policy; *Educational Practice; Effective Teaching; Field Experience Programs; *Higher Education; Questionnaires; *Research Projects; *School Surveys; Teacher Evaluation; Universities

ABSTRACT

The Institutional Survey of Selected Policies and Practices in Higher Education questionnaire was mailed out in the early spring of 1973 to the presidents of 755 institutions. Responses from the 669 usable returned questionnaires indicated: (1) The nation's colleges and universities have implemented many policies and practices designed to meet the needs of larger and more heterogeneous student bodies. (2) The extent to which different types of institutions have implemented particular policies and practices varies considerably. (3) Many institutions give either academic credit or advanced placement for external learning experiences. (4) About 65% of the institutions have some form of open admissions. (5) Students and guidance counselors would do well to note that many institutions favor admission on a first-come-first-serve basis. (6) Quota systems in admissions are relatively rare. (7) Nearly all institutions report that students evaluate teaching effectiveness. (8) Over three-fourths of the institutions exert some control over student publications. (9) A similar proportion have some procedure for the discipline of students by students. (10) Many institutions provide counseling and guidance about sexual matters and drug usage. The appendices include the questionnaire form. (Author/MJM)

FILMED FROM BEST AVAILABLE COPY

ED 082635

Selected Policies and Practices in Higher Education

John A. Creager

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

HE 004 661

Office of Research

ACE Research Reports

Vol. 8, No. 4, 1973

AMERICAN COUNCIL ON EDUCATION

Roger W. Heyns, *President*

The American Council on Education, founded in 1918, is a council of educational organizations and institutions. Its purpose is to advance education and educational methods through comprehensive voluntary and cooperative action on the part of American educational associations, organizations, and institutions.

The Council's Office of Research was established in 1965 to assume responsibility for conducting research on questions of general concern to higher education. *ACE Research Reports* are designed to expedite communication of the Office's research findings to a limited number of educational researchers and other interested persons.

OFFICE OF RESEARCH STAFF

Alexander W. Astin, *Director*

Alan E. Bayer, *Associate Director*

Ann S. Bisconti, *Adjunct Research Associate*

Kathleen B. Brosi, *Programmer*

Marsha D. Brown, *Research Analyst*

Judy M. Cangialosi, *Secretary*

John A. Creager, *Research Associate*

Jeffrey E. Dutton, *Project Director, Higher Education Panel*

Elaine H. El-Khawas, *Adjunct Research Associate*

Charles S. Fletcher, *Programmer*

Mary C. Henderson, *Secretary*

Engin I. Holmstrom, *Research Associate*

Laura P. Kent, *Editor*

Margo R. King, *Staff Assistant*

Linda D. Molm, *Research Analyst*

Jeannie T. Royer, *Research Assistant*

Charles L. Sell, *Chief, Data Processing*

Barbara A. Toner, *Programmer*

Joan C. Trexler, *Research Assistant*

Carol F. Van Alstyne, *Economist*

ACE RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Jessie S. Bernard
Research Scholar Honoris Causa
Pennsylvania State University

John G. Darley
Chairman, Department of Psychology
University of Minnesota

James A. Davis
Director
National Opinion Research Center

Edgar G. Epps
Professor of Urban Education
The University of Chicago

Nathaniel L. Gage
Committee Chairman
Professor of Education and Psychology
Stanford University

Richard C. Gilman
President
Occidental College

Edmond P. Gordon
Professor and Chairman, Department of Guidance
Teachers College
Columbia University

W. Lee Hansen
Chairman, Department of Economics
University of Wisconsin

Alice S. Rossi
Professor, Department of Sociology
Goucher College

William H. Sewell
Professor, Department of Sociology
University of Wisconsin

Michael Useem
Assistant Professor, Department of Sociology
Harvard University

Dael Wolfle
Graduate School of Public Affairs
University of Washington

Additional copies of this *Research Report* (Vol. 8, No. 4, 1973) may be obtained from the Publications Division, American Council on Education, One Dupont Circle, Washington, D.C. 20036. Please remit $3.00 per copy with your order.

ED 082635

Selected Policies and Practices in Higher Education

John A. Creager

ACE RESEARCH REPORTS

Vol. 8, No. 4

September, 1973

Office of Research
American Council on Education

HIGHLIGHTS

- The nation's colleges and universities have implemented many policies and practices designed to meet the needs of larger and more heterogeneous student bodies, at a time when many social and cultural values are changing.

- The extent to which different types of institutions have implemented particular policies and practices varies considerably. There is also variation among different divisions or departments of an institution, depending on their judgment of the relevance of a particular policy.

- Many institutions give either academic credit or advanced placement for external learning experiences, thus either decreasing the time and cost of undergraduate education or providing for curricular enrichment.

- About 65 percent of the institutions have some form of "open admissions." Many, especially the two-year colleges, report mixed strategies of admissions. High school graduation is the most common criterion; there is little enthusiasm for a pure lottery approach.

- Students and guidance counselors would do well to note that many institutions, particularly the two-year colleges, favor admissions on a first come first served basis; therefore, prospective college students should not delay filing applications.

- Quota systems in admissions are relatively rare, but special efforts to recruit minority-group members and veterans are widespread.

- Nearly all institutions report that students evaluate teaching effectiveness; about two-thirds say the practice is institutionwide, not restricted to specific departments or courses. Dissemination of this evaluative information is, however, typically restricted. Despite some uncertainty about the reliability and validity of such ratings, they are used by more than one-third of the institutions in decisions about faculty promotions and salary increases.

- Over three-fourths of the institutions exert some control -- primarily advisory rather than censory -- over student publications.

- A similar proportion have some procedure for the discipline of students by students: e.g., a student judiciary committee.

- Many institutions provide services and guidance in relation to sexual matters and to drug usage.

- A wide variety of grading systems exists in the higher education system. Multiple grading systems are common within institutions. The letter grade system is still very much intact. Pass/fail grading is the most popular of the "reforms." Numerical grading, though seldom being reported explicitly, is used in computing grade-point averages.

- To give curricular flexibility that will meet the special needs of different kinds of students, many institutions have introduced various special programs, the most common being ethnic studies, independent studies, acceleration opportunities, interdisciplinary studies, and remedial programs.

- All types of institutions make extensive use of recent technological development and of interdisciplinary techniques in instruction. The proportion of students exposed to any particular instructional procedure is constrained by the suitability of those procedures to particular disciplines and educational levels.

Acknowledgements

The survey on which this report is based was made possible by the gratifying cooperation of busy administrators across the spectrum of higher education. The content of this report is our initial expression of gratitude for their participation.

Special thanks are due to Logan Wilson, President Emeritus, and to Roger Heyns, President of the American Council on Education, for their support and helpful suggestions on this project. Alexander W. Astin, now at UCLA, Todd Furniss of the Council, Jack Rossmann of Macalaster College, and my colleagues in the Office of Research also advised me on the content of the survey. The author retains full responsibility, however, for any shortcomings of this study.

Margo Jackson, now with the National Academy of Sciences-National Research Council, carried most of the logistic burden of conducting this survey in addition to the many other duties well performed while she was with the Office of Research.

Preparation of the final report was completed by Jeannie T. Royer; Margo King, now at UCLA, prepared the tables from the computer printouts. Despite considerable heterogeneity of content in the report, Laura Kent's editorial review added much to the clarity and coherence of this report. The reliable assistance of these persons was most appreciated in the preparation of this document.

The processing of survey data included verified keypunching by Jackie Williams and computer programming efforts by Barbara Toner and Charles Sell. Their conscientious efforts are greatly appreciated. Additional aid, provided by Martin Ozga and Edward Creager at various points is also appreciated.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

		Page
I	Introduction	1
II	The Survey Instrument	2
III	The Survey Sample	3
IV	Survey Results	4
	A. Academic Credit or Advanced Placement for Quasi-Academic or Extracollege Experiences	5
	B. Admissions Policies and Practices	5
	C. Student Evaluations of Teaching Effectiveness	7
	D. Policies and Practices Concerning Student Behaviors and Services to Students	7
	E. Grading Practices	8
	F. Special Undergraduate Programs	10
	G. Instructional Facilities and Procedures	11
V	Epilogue	12
VI	References	13

LIST OF TABLES

I	Table 1: Stratum Counts for Population and Sample Institutions and Weights Used in Computing Survey Response Statistics	17
II	Table 2: Institutional Policies and Practices on Academic Credit, Advanced Placement, Admissions, Teaching Effectiveness, and Student Relations, by Type and Control of Institution	18
III	Table 3: Institutional Policies and Practices on Grading, Undergraduate Programs, and Instructional Facilities, by Type and Control of Institution	19

APPENDICES

I	APPENDIX A: Institutional Survey of Selected Policies and Practices in Higher Education	21
II	Appendix B: A Note on the Precision of the Item Response Percentages	27

Selected Policies and Practices in Higher Education[1]

John A. Creager

The policies and practices of the nation's colleges and universities constitute the means for achieving the aims of higher education. But "higher education" is a somewhat abstract concept, and its aims are complex and multitudinous. Obviously, no single institution can hope to achieve all the ends of the higher education system as a whole. Different institutions have different missions; therefore, policies and practices may vary considerably from one institution to another. Moreover, within a given institution, these may have different effects on different kinds of students on the campus.

The Cooperative Institutional Research Program (CIRP) of the American Council on Education (ACE) was designed primarily to study the impact of various college environments on the development of undergraduates. In the eight years since its inception, the CIRP has built up an extensive longitudinal data base, a base which already includes many measures of the college environment that have proved useful in analyzing impact (Kent, 1972). Such measures include student behaviors, student and faculty perceptions and attitudes, structural and financial characteristics of institutions, and such administrative-taxonomic variables as type, control, and the sex composition and racial composition of the student body. Missing has been any measure of policies and practices, particularly those that have been introduced, or changed, in recent years, either to improve the quality of the educational process or to meet the needs of special groups of students (e.g., "new" types of students such as the economically, culturally, and educationally disadvantaged who are now entering college in large numbers).

---

[1]This study was supported in part by Grant GI-34394 from the Research Applied to National Needs (RANN) program of the National Science Foundation.

Nonetheless, these policies and practices often have some direct effect on the students and therefore constitute an important part of the learning environment. In order to remedy this deficiency in our data, a survey was undertaken in the spring of 1973; its aim was to learn more about policies and practices at a large number of diverse institutions.

The Survey Instrument

The Institutional Survey of Selected Policies and Practices in Higher Education was developed over a two-year period; members of the Council's staff and of the Research Advisory Committee suggested ideas for items and reviewed those that had been formulated. A preliminary version of the survey was completed by the academic vice-president of a private university, who also offered comments. Although originally conceived to cover a wider range of policies and practices, considerations of the time required of the busy administrator to complete too long a form led us to limit the final questionnaire to items dealing with those policies and practices most likely to have a direct impact on the student. The basic focus was to be on issues that have been extensively discussed in recent years and on innovations in higher education. It should be pointed out, however, that some institutions have been pioneers in introducing these innovations, whereas others have no immediate intention of introducing them, perhaps because their constituencies do not particularly require them. Still other institutions are at some stage of planning and implementing changes in their policies and practices.

The survey items cover the following topics:

1. The granting of academic credit or advanced placement for various quasi-academic or extra college experiences
2. Admissions policies and practices

3. The design, use, and dissemination of student evaluations of teaching effectiveness
4. The control of certain student behaviors and the availability of certain nonacademic services to students
5. Grading practices
6. The availability of special instructional programs
7. The availability of special facilities or techniques of instruction.

A copy of the survey questionnaire is given in Appendix A.

The Survey Sample

The survey questionnaire, the Institutional Survey of Selected Policies and Practices in Higher Education, was mailed out in the early spring of 1973 to the presidents of 755 institutions which had participated in the Cooperative Institutional Research Program at some time between 1966 and 1972. Two of these institutions were dropped from the survey -- one because it had discontinued operations, and the other because it had merged with another participating institution. The higher education population used in this research program consists essentially of those institutions which admit first-time, full-time freshmen and which are listed in the annual directories of higher education published by the U.S. Office of Education. Thus, some seminaries and professional schools which require undergraduate credits for admission are excluded. The total number of institutions included in the population from which the program participants were taken over the 1966-1972 period is 2,573.

Of the 753 institutions that were mailed the survey questionnaires, 673 (89.4 percent) responded after a reminder postcard was mailed to initial nonrespondents and followup phone calls were made to subsequent nonrespondents.

Of the 673 responding institutions, 669 (88.8 percent of the contact sample) returned usable response data. The overall sampling rate was 25.9 percent of the universe of institutions. A more detailed description of the participation rate by type of institution is presented in Table 1.

The survey instrument was mailed directly to presidents, chancellors, or provosts of institutions. About 20 percent of the questionnaires were completed by the addressee, but many presidents delegated responsibility for completing the form to vice-presidents or academic deans (42 percent), directors of institutional research (16 percent), and registrars or admissions officers (15 percent). The remaining respondents included deans of students, counselors, and test officers.

Survey Results

The results of the survey are presented in this report as the weighted percentages of institutions reporting various policies and practices. These percentages are estimates obtained through statistical weighting procedures which allow for the disproportionate participation of institutions within the 37 strata shown in Table 1, which also indicates stratum weights. Appendix B discusses the precision of these estimates.

Tables 2 and 3 present the survey results for three types of institutions (two-year colleges, four-year colleges, and universities, as these are defined by the Office of Education) and for all institutions. Each of these categories is further subdivided into the public and the private sector. It should be noted that, on many items, multiple responses are possible; thus, item response percentages may total to more or less than 100 percent. Usually multiple responses may indicate policy variations within an institution among divisions or departments. Moreover, in comparing the percentages across the various groups of institutions, one

should keep in mind that not all policies, practices, or facilities are relevant to all kinds of institutions.

The following discussion points out some of the highlights in the results and provides additional information about institutional responses to certain items.

Academic Credit or Advanced Placement for Quasi-Academic or Extracollege Experiences

By granting academic credit, or advanced placement without credit, for external educational or work experiences, an institution allows the student greater curricular flexibility. Either he can complete his undergraduate requirements in less time and at lower cost, or he can enrich his educational experience by taking courses other than those that merely repeat previously learned material. Such enrichment may lead to greater depth in a particular area or may allow a broader scope involving several areas. Institutions were more likely to grant academic credit for most of the "external" experiences, with the exception of college-level work completed in high school, for which advanced placement without credit was granted. Universities, perhaps because of their greater size and heterogeneity, were more likely than were the four-year and two-year colleges to allow the student both types of flexibility. Differences between public and private institutions were generally smaller than those among types of institutions.

Admissions Policies and Practices

As a result of the growing demand to open the doors of higher education to the disadvantaged -- economically, socially, and educationally (i.e., those whose high school experience has left them ill-prepared to do college-level work) -- many institutions have made special efforts to make their admissions policies more flexible while at the same time maintaining academic standards. For instance, they have made less use of rigid cutoffs on

standard achievement test scores but have used the test information to evaluate the special needs of these new kinds of students. As another example, about three-fourths of the institutions surveyed have allowed some secondary students to enroll in college courses without admitting them as full-time undergraduates.

In evaluating applicants for college, overall appraisal of the dossier is far more frequent in private than in public institutions; this is probably a function of institutional size, the smaller institutions having a smaller applicant group to evaluate.

Special efforts to recruit members of specific ethnic groups and veterans were frequently reported. The phrase, "control the proportion of" in several items may have biased response rates downward, since it implies that limitations were set on the proportions of women, blacks, and members of other ethnic groups who would be admitted. Institutions show little enthusiasm either for preferential treatment or for differential quotas in admissions; rather, they try to accommodate to social needs by being more flexible in both admissions practices and instructional procedures.

One of the major issues in meeting the demand to spread the benefits of higher education has been that of "open admissions." Although this term means different things in different institutions, some 65 percent of the institutions reported some form of open admissions; some institutions, particularly public two-year colleges, have a mixed policy. Open admissions are more common in the public than in the private institutions, as might be expected. However, the lottery approach to admissions is rarely used. The substantial number of institutions that favor open admissions on a first come first served basis indicates that guidance counselors should urge their students to submit applications to college at the earliest possible time.

Variations in admissions procedures have two major effects on an analysis of the impact of policies and practices of institutions upon student outcomes. First, to the extent that admissions become more open, the match between inputs and environments becomes more nearly random. Nevertheless, the pattern remains far from completely random and, therefore, differential inputs and their effects must still be taken into account when evaluating effects of college environments. Second, certain aspects of college environments -- especially the peer environments -- change. Concomitantly, the administrative, classroom, and physical environments, and the college image, probably change, along with the changing patterns of admissions. (For further explanation of these environments, see Astin, 1968.) Moreover, the interrelations among these environments, and any joint effects they may have on student outcomes, may well be affected (Creager and Astin, 1968).

Student Evaluations of Teaching Effectiveness

Practically all respondents reported that student evaluations of teaching effectiveness were being made in their institutions. Approximately two-thirds said that the practice was widespread rather than being restricted to certain departments or courses. Slightly more than one-third of the institutions used these evaluations in decisions about faculty promotions or salary increases. Only about one-seventh, however, made the results generally available to the campus community; nearly half restrict dissemination to the individual faculty member. Universities are more likely than other institutions to use student evaluations in faculty promotions and to disseminate the findings; differences between public and private institutions were less marked.

Policies and Practices Concerning Student Behaviors and Services to Students

A small and heterogeneous group of items in the survey was designed to measure timely, but previously untapped, aspects of the college environment

that have potential effects on students: These related to the control of certain student behaviors and activities and to services provided to students. It was found, for instance, that the administration commonly exercises some kind of control over student publication, most often in an advisory rather than a censory capacity. Procedures for the discipline of students by students were available at three-fourths of the institutions, more commonly at the four-year colleges than at the two-year colleges. This difference may reflect the less cohesive social environments of the two-year colleges, with their high ratio of commuters to residents. The requirement that students attend religious services has practically disappeared from the public sector of higher education; even in the private sector, the requirement seems to be confined to the church-sponsored institutions.

Policies pertaining to services to students in sexual matters and drug usage reflect institutional concern for coping with the possible consequences of recent changes in social attitudes and student behaviors in these areas. Uniformly, the larger universities, with their heterogeneous student bodies and possibly greater resources, reported more services in these areas.

Grading Practices

The procedures used in evaluating student performance varied considerably among institutions, particularly in such psychometric considerations as the coding and scaling of grades. Practically all institutions still use letter grades in at least some division; only a few have completely abandoned record keeping of course grades. Nevertheless, in response to various pressures, many institutions use dichotomous or trichotomous grading, typically because it is felt that such a system reduces an excessive concern with fine distinctions which may be less than reliable and that it lessens excessive competition for the mark rather than the substance of the performance.

But this view is moderated by the consideration that outstanding performance will be less frequent if not rewarded in some way. Complete grading systems require that the faculty member be able to report such nonscalable outcomes as the student's withdrawing or failing to complete the course, in addition to the rank ordering of performance. It is no wonder, then, that many patterns of grading exist, often within the same institution.

Initial analysis of responses to the grading items revealed high rates of nonresponse and extremely small differences in rates of the use of a particular grading system in all vs. most vs. few courses. It was assumed that the high level of nonresponse to all but the "letter grades" item meant that the grading practices did not apply in that institution, and therefore, in Table 3, the responses for "in no courses" were combined with the nonresponses and the "all", "most", and "few" categories were combined.

Numerical grading was not very common -- least of all in the two-year colleges -- probably because it is difficult to assign numerical grades to performance that involves the evaluation of essays and recitations. Even when objective testing is pertinent and convenient, it is not particularly easy to assign weights to problems of differing difficulty.

Simple pass/fail grading was the most usual of the dichotomous methods, especially in the universities. Student participation in the grading process, with or without faculty review, has attained some degree of popularity. Note that these methods are not mutually exclusive and that the data clearly indicate multiple practices within institutions.

The survey form permitted the respondent to specify additional grading practices beyond those listed. Of 55 such "other" responses, 35 could be readily classified as elaborations or qualifications of checked responses to offered alternatives. For example, there were some special variations on the letter grades, on the honors, pass/fail, and credit/no credit

alternatives. Some variation of credit/no credit was reported under "other" by 12 institutions. Some institutions gave students the option of choosing the grading system to be applied to them and of deciding whether or not "incomplete" grades would be entered into the computed grade-point average. In computing a GPA, letter grades are in fact converted to numerical counterparts. Three institutions noted such special approaches as "competency grading" and grading of the fulfillment of a learning contract.

Special Undergraduate Programs

The curriculum has also been undergoing many changes in recent years, as colleges and universities attempt to accommodate to the heterogeneous needs and special experiences of new types of students. Even though the proportion of students involved in a special program at a given institution is usually small (typically less than 10 percent of the total enrollment), taken together, across programs and institutions, the numbers affected may be substantial.

We attempted to identify not only those programs in effect at the time of the survey but also those tried and abandoned and those planned for early implementation. Since nonresponse rates to particular programs listed were appreciable, we regarded "no response" as indistinguishable from "no plans." Moreover, the rates reported for "tried but abandoned" programs were very low, except for honors programs (discontinued by 6.5 percent of the institutions) and remedial programs (discontinued by 3.2 percent). The reasons why these programs were dropped are unknown: They may have involved low student demand or high costs within a particular institution rather than disenchantment with the basic idea or ineffective implementation. It was decided to report in Table 3 only the rates of special programs "in effect" or "planned."

The introduction of certain kinds of studies may well depend on the social history of a recognized need. While nearly half the institutions reported ethnic studies in effect and only about one-seventh reported active women's studies, plans for introducing such studies show a reverse pattern: 8.6 percent were planning to introduce women's studies, and 3.6 percent were planning to introduce ethnic studies. Apparently, ethnic studies are much farther along the growth curve (or "bandwagon effect") than are women's studies.

Nearly all special programs were much more common in universities than in four-year or two-year institutions. Again, this is probably a function of size, resources, and heterogeneity of the student body. The relatively higher rates for work/study programs, interdisciplinary programs, independent study, and accelerated degree programs, even in the two-year colleges, indicate greater curricular flexibility and potential enrichment of the academic experience than has been true in the past.

That remedial programs are so widely available reflects the less stringent admissions policies, which mean a more heterogeneous student body with respect to their preparation for college. The costs and other problems created in admitting the less well-prepared student are offset by the humanitarian and egalitarian implications of such policies.

Instructional Facilities and Procedures

Not only have institutions implemented policies enriching the curricular offerings, but they have also facilitated the instructional process in many ways. The survey inquired about nine groups of methods that affect instruction. Five have to do with technological developments now available at reasonable costs to institutions. One refers to the question of whether facilities are available to students or are kept locked up; another refers to the modularization of teaching materials, which permits flexible

serializing of learning and can be adapted to individual needs and rates of progress. Two groups refer to interdisciplinary flexibilities that can help in implementing corresponding program flexibility. Although the percentages of institutions indicating that they used a given procedure or facility was high for all items, typically fewer than a third of the students are exposed to any particular one, probably because each is differentially suited to a given discipline and at a given educational level. These procedures and facilities require financial resources, and cost-effectiveness needs to be determined by integrating impact and economic analysis.

Epilogue

The present study is descriptive, dealing with the incidence of various policies and practices across the system of higher education in the United States. As such, it is only a first step. What is needed now is that these data, available for the first time, be integrated with student input-output data. In that way, longitudinal analyses of the effectiveness of these different policies and practices in terms of their impact on various student outcomes and on society can be carried out. Taken in conjunction with relevant cost data, such analyses can provide a sounder empirical basis for ascertaining what policies are wise under what conditions and for which types of students.

References

Astin, Alexander W. The College Environment. Washington: American Council on Education, 1968.

Creager, John A., and Astin, Alexander W. "Alternative Methods of Describing Characteristics of Colleges and Universities," Educational and Psychological Measurement, Vol. 28, No. 3 (Autumn, 1968), pp. 719-734.

Kent, Laura P. The ACE Office of Research: Its Purposes and Activities. Washington: American Council on Education, 1972.

TABLES

Table 1

Stratum Counts for Population and Sample Institutions and Weights Used in Computing Survey Response Statistics

Stratum	Number of Institutions in Population	Number of Participants	Stratum Weight[a]
Public University Selectivity:[b]			
1. Less than 550 or unknown	72	38	1.89
2. 550-599	31	17	1.82
3. 600 or more	16	12	1.33
Private University Selectivity:[b]			
4. Less than 550 or unknown	18	11	1.64
5. 550-599	14	9	1.56
6. 600 or more	36	23	1.57
Four-Year Public College Selectivity:[b]			
7. Less than 450	96	16	6.00
8. 450-499	66	22	3.00
9. 500 or more	74	23	3.22
10. Unknown	101	29	3.48
Four-Year Private Nonsectarian Selectivity:[b]			
11. Less than 500	74	27	2.74
12. 500-574	36	14	2.57
13. 575-649	49	27	1.81
14 650 or more	51	33	1.55
15. Unknown	156	21	7.43
Four-Year Catholic Selectivity:[b]			
16. Less than 500	58	17	3.41
17. 500-574	72	25	2.88
18. 575 or more	37	18	2.06
19. Unknown	47	8	5.88
Four-Year Other Sectarian Selectivity:[b]			
20. Less than 450	56	15	3.73
21. 450-499	54	15	3.60
22. 500-574	73	26	2.81
23. 575 or more	54	28	1.93
24. Unknown	99	12	8.25
Two-Year Public Enrollment:[c]			
25. Less than 100	26	4	6.50
26. 100-249	122	13	9.38
27. 250-499	239	34	7.03
28. 500-999	221	33	6.70
29. 1,000 or more	198	32	6.19
Two-Year Private Enrollment:[c]			
30. Less than 100	61	10	6.10
31. 100-249	97	15	6.47
32. 250-499	42	5	8.40
33. 500 or more	25	5	5.00
Predominantly Black			
34. Public four-year	36	15	2.40
35. Private four-year	49	14	3.50
36. Public two-year	7	1	7.00
37. Private two-year	10	2	5.00
TOTAL	2573	669	--

[a]The stratum weight is the number of institutions in the population divided by the number of participants.

[b]Selectivity is a measure of the academic quality of the entering freshman class; and it is further described in National Norms for Entering College Freshmen - Fall 1968, in footnote 1, p. 3.

[c]First-time, full-time enrollment, Fall, 1971.

Table 2

Institutional Policies and Practices on Academic Credit, Advanced Placement, Admissions, Teaching Effectiveness, and Student Relations, by Type and Control of Institution (Weighted Percentages)

Item	Two-Year Colleges			Four-Year Colleges			Universities			Total, All Institutions		
	Public	Private	Total	Public	Private	Total	Public	Private	Total	Public	Private	Total
1(a) ACADEMIC CREDIT GRANTED TOWARD A DEGREE FOR:												
College-level work completed in secondary school	35.3	29.9	34.1	51.9	48.1	49.2	57.3	74.6	63.6	42.1	46.1	44.1
College-level work completed in a nonaccredited institution with accreditation pending	46.4	61.7	49.8	57.0	65.9	63.4	58.5	46.3	54.1	50.5	64.0	57.2
College-level work completed in an institution whose accreditation has been refused or rescinded	9.1	5.1	8.2	9.1	8.0	8.3	9.3	6.0	8.1	9.1	7.4	8.3
Education or training in industry or military service	43.3	25.2	39.3	65.1	47.6	52.4	62.7	39.7	54.3	51.2	43.0	47.2
Work experience in industry or military service	25.9	5.1	21.2	26.9	19.2	21.3	17.9	6.0	13.6	25.5	16.0	20.8
Successful completion of standardized achievement test (e.g., CLEP or AP)	71.4	59.8	68.8	80.1	82.9	82.1	91.5	86.6	89.7	75.7	78.8	77.2
Correspondence courses given by your institution	27.2	10.3	23.4	20.4	7.3	10.9	52.1	13.4	38.0	27.6	8.1	18.0
Correspondence courses given by other institutions	64.4	57.4	62.8	59.9	55.3	56.6	76.9	29.9	59.8	64.3	54.3	59.4
Course credit by examination without taking the course	82.8	42.3	73.7	78.8	69.4	72.0	94.1	62.7	82.7	82.6	64.0	73.4
Extension, continuing education, or adult education courses	69.2	37.2	62.0	78.0	50.6	58.2	87.2	44.1	71.4	73.3	47.8	60.7
Extensive travel and/or overseas living experience	13.4	7.3	12.0	19.6	21.1	20.7	15.3	10.4	13.5	15.4	16.1	16.7
Remedial courses given by your institution	40.3	26.5	37.2	27.7	19.5	21.8	14.4	4.4	10.8	34.4	20.0	27.3
1(b) ADVANCED PLACEMENT WITHOUT CREDIT GRANTED FOR:												
College-level work completed in secondary school	41.1	35.0	39.8	43.8	64.5	58.8	46.2	74.6	56.5	42.3	59.6	50.8
College-level work completed in a nonaccredited institution with accreditation pending	12.9	8.1	11.9	19.4	25.2	23.6	23.7	29.9	25.9	15.8	22.4	19.1
College-level work completed in an institution whose accreditation has been refused or rescinded	5.7	4.7	5.4	7.5	9.3	8.9	10.2	11.8	10.8	6.7	8.6	7.6
Education or training in industry or military service	20.1	9.0	17.6	19.6	22.6	21.8	24.6	29.9	26.5	20.4	20.5	20.5
Work experience in industry or military service	13.7	2.6	11.2	13.2	8.7	10.0	10.2	9.0	9.7	13.3	7.7	10.5
Successful completion of standardized achievement test (e.g., CLEP or AP)	33.5	22.6	31.1	39.5	46.0	44.2	54.2	74.6	61.6	37.1	43.2	40.1
Correspondence courses given by your institution	0.9	2.6	1.2	3.5	0.8	1.6	16.1	1.5	10.8	3.0	1.3	2.2
Correspondence courses given by other institutions	15.9	6.0	13.7	9.4	11.9	11.2	26.3	10.4	20.5	15.0	10.9	12.9
Course credit by examination without taking the course	20.9	19.2	20.6	24.7	27.0	26.3	35.9	34.3	35.3	23.4	26.0	24.7
Extension, continuing education, or adult education courses	15.1	11.5	14.3	13.7	13.1	13.2	31.4	16.2	25.8	16.2	13.0	14.6
Extensive travel and/or overseas living experience	2.2	5.1	2.9	9.1	4.3	5.6	2.5	1.5	2.2	4.3	4.4	4.4
Remedial courses given by your institution	10.0	4.7	8.8	6.2	7.3	7.0	5.9	6.0	5.9	8.6	6.8	7.7
2 ADMISSIONS POLICIES AND PRACTICES												
Stated minimum admissions requirements for all first-year, nontransfer students	63.4	72.6	65.9	87.6	64.8	71.1	81.4	61.2	74.1	71.9	66.0	69.0
Special selection standards to control the proportion of women students	0.0	2.6	0.6	4.8	2.1	2.8	2.9	4.5	3.2	1.6	2.3	1.9
Special selection standards to control the proportion of black students	0.0	0.0	0.0	3.2	4.1	3.9	5.1	20.9	10.9	1.5	4.3	2.9
Special selection standards to control the proportion of students from other ethnic groups	0.0	0.0	0.0	3.8	3.3	3.4	8.5	16.2	11.3	1.8	3.4	2.6
Special admissions policies to control the proportion of students by geographic origin	9.7	2.6	8.1	19.6	1.8	6.7	28.0	10.4	21.6	14.2	2.4	8.4
Special efforts to recruit students from specific ethnic groups	44.5	35.9	42.5	64.2	56.3	58.5	77.1	83.8	79.6	53.1	54.0	53.5
Preferential admissions to spouses of matriculated students	0.9	4.7	1.7	0.0	8.2	5.9	5.9	11.8	8.1	1.1	7.7	4.4
Preferential admissions to veterans	37.2	18.4	33.0	42.1	34.1	36.1	41.5	29.9	37.3	38.8	31.0	35.0
Enrollment in some undergraduate courses by high school students (exclude extension, correspondence, or adult education)	78.6	68.8	76.4	74.7	67.3	69.3	81.4	65.7	75.7	77.7	67.4	72.7
Highly individualized admissions decisions based on appraisal of total applicant dossier	18.7	46.6	25.0	43.0	70.3	62.7	36.4	83.8	53.8	27.3	66.7	46.7
Open admissions by lottery	0.7	0.0	0.6	0.0	0.3	0.2	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.5	0.2	0.4
Open admissions on a first-come, first-served basis	38.9	12.4	33.0	7.5	5.8	6.3	4.2	0.0	2.7	26.8	6.8	17.0
Open admissions to any high school graduate	64.3	37.2	58.2	18.8	7.3	10.5	13.7	1.5	9.2	46.8	12.5	29.9
Open admissions, other	35.4	10.7	29.9	14.8	8.3	10.1	6.8	4.4	5.9	27.0	8.6	17.9
3 STUDENT EVALUATIONS OF TEACHING EFFECTIVENESS ARE:												
Made in all or nearly all departments	65.9	59.8	64.6	64.0	66.0	65.4	58.5	70.1	62.7	64.6	65.0	64.8
Made only in some departments	13.2	4.7	11.3	27.7	15.0	18.6	30.5	20.9	27.0	18.9	13.5	16.2
Made only in some courses	23.4	20.9	22.8	18.5	19.5	19.2	27.1	20.9	24.9	22.4	19.8	21.1
Used in faculty promotions or salary increases	52.4	6.4	26.6	49.5	37.7	40.9	55.1	50.7	53.5	39.3	32.6	36.0
Made generally available to campus community	6.3	6.0	6.2	18.0	17.9	18.0	40.7	46.3	42.7	12.7	17.3	15.0
Fed back only to individual faculty member	52.5	54.3	52.9	41.7	47.4	45.8	41.0	20.9	33.7	48.4	47.2	47.8
Selectively disseminated under administrative control	37.6	22.6	34.2	29.0	20.7	23.1	27.4	13.4	22.3	34.2	20.7	27.5
4 POLICIES AND PRACTICES CONCERNING STUDENT BEHAVIOR OR STUDENT SERVICES												
Student publications subject to the advice of administration or faculty	84.1	70.5	81.1	84.4	69.2	73.4	74.6	60.3	69.4	83.3	68.9	76.2
Student publications subject to the consent of administration or faculty	12.9	21.8	14.9	5.9	10.1	8.9	5.1	6.0	5.4	10.3	12.1	11.2
Procedures available for the discipline of students by students (e.g., student judiciary committee)	68.0	64.1	67.1	82.8	83.9	83.6	78.0	77.6	77.8	73.1	79.9	76.4
Students required to attend religious services	0.0	27.4	6.1	0.0	15.0	10.9	0.9	1.5	1.1	0.1	16.6	8.2
Health service permitted to issue contraceptives	2.3	0.0	1.8	18.5	16.5	17.1	56.8	44.1	52.2	12.0	14.9	13.4
Special policies for health-related guidance in sexual matters (e.g., abortion referral)	24.0	17.9	22.7	37.4	28.2	30.8	53.4	61.2	56.2	30.5	28.1	29.3
Special policies for guidance in drug usage	34.1	29.5	33.1	40.1	42.4	41.8	50.8	50.7	50.8	37.4	40.6	38.9
Coed dormitories, with sexes segregated by floors or wings	13.8	13.7	13.8	37.9	34.3	35.3	73.7	70.1	72.4	26.2	32.4	29.2
Coed dormitories, with sexes segregated by rooms, same floor or wing	0.7	0.0	0.6	15.3	11.8	12.8	17.8	41.8	26.5	6.5	11.2	8.8

Table 3

Institutional Policies and Practices on Grading, Undergraduate Programs, and Instructional Facilities, by Type and Control of Institution (Weighted Percentages)

	Item	Two-Year Colleges			Four-Year Colleges			Universities			Total, All Institutions		
		Public	Private	Total	Public	Private	Total	Public	Private	Total	Public	Private	Total
5	GRADING PRACTICES												
	Letter grades	98.4	100.0	98.8	94.9	94.9	94.9	99.1	98.5	98.9	97.4	96.0	96.7
	Numerical grades	3.9	4.3	4.0	5.6	7.9	7.3	10.2	16.2	12.4	5.1	7.7	6.4
	Pass-fail	48.6	25.6	43.5	65.9	57.1	59.5	84.6	83.6	84.2	56.7	52.6	54.7
	Satisfactory-unsatisfactory	26.1	13.7	23.2	40.6	23.1	28.0	41.5	32.4	38.2	31.6	21.9	26.8
	Pass-no record	10.3	10.7	10.4	13.7	15.8	15.2	19.5	10.4	16.2	12.2	14.7	13.4
	Honors--pass-fail	8.4	6.0	7.8	9.7	12.8	12.0	28.8	13.4	23.2	10.7	11.7	11.2
	Completed-incomplete	22.7	17.1	21.4	25.0	20.9	22.0	31.4	26.9	29.7	24.2	20.6	22.4
	Descriptive reports by faculty	13.3	10.2	12.6	14.0	16.6	15.9	28.0	32.4	29.6	15.0	16.2	15.6
	Faculty evaluation of self-evaluative report by student	15.6	10.3	14.4	12.4	10.5	11.0	28.2	6.0	20.1	15.9	10.3	13.1
	Student self-grading	17.1	8.1	15.1	8.6	11.0	10.3	26.5	14.9	22.3	15.6	10.7	13.2
	No record kept of individual course grades	1.6	0.0	1.2	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.5	1.5	2.2	1.3	0.1	0.7
6(a)	SPECIAL UNDERGRADUATE PROGRAMS IN EFFECT												
	Ethnic studies	44.3	27.8	40.6	52.7	40.6	43.9	77.1	65.7	73.0	49.6	39.6	44.7
	Women's studies	13.2	10.7	12.6	11.8	14.3	13.6	34.7	27.9	32.3	14.8	14.4	14.6
	Honors program	19.8	28.6	21.8	56.5	46.8	49.5	87.2	83.6	85.9	36.3	45.4	40.8
	Career-related work/study	74.6	34.2	65.5	59.9	46.6	50.3	58.5	44.8	53.5	68.9	44.2	56.7
	Interdepartment/interdisciplinary (e.g., urban, environmental)	33.5	37.6	34.4	65.6	72.4	70.5	83.1	94.0	87.0	47.3	67.1	57.1
	Independent undergraduate study and/or research	51.0	42.7	49.1	84.4	86.2	85.7	86.4	91.0	88.1	63.7	78.3	70.9
	Accelerated degree program (exclude advance placement; include freedom to carry heavier load per term, credit by exam, etc.)	62.7	48.3	59.4	72.0	70.3	70.8	85.6	82.1	84.3	67.4	66.9	67.1
	Study abroad	19.7	30.8	22.2	55.6	73.0	68.2	84.7	91.0	87.0	36.0	66.1	50.9
	Off-campus study in special American subcultures (Indian reservations, Black communities, Appalachian regions, etc.)	5.6	12.8	7.2	21.2	27.6	25.8	26.3	27.9	26.9	12.5	24.9	18.4
	Dual degree with other institutions	13.8	4.7	11.7	16.4	37.3	31.5	32.2	34.3	33.9	16.3	31.2	23.6
	Individualized programs with no specific course requirements (distributional requirements only)	25.0	14.1	22.5	26.9	30..	29.6	54.2	44.1	50.5	28.2	28.3	28.3
	Individualized programs with no specific course requirements (complete freedom of choice)	4.8	5.1	4.9	4.8	17.4	13.9	15.3	20.9	17.3	5.8	15.4	10.5
	Correspondence and/or other home study	27.3	0.0	21.2	20.2	5.9	9.9	48.7	10.4	34.8	27.2	5.1	16.3
	External degree programs	6.2	0.0	4.8	7.3	3.6	4.6	8.5	9.0	8.7	6.8	3.2	5.1
	Remedial programs	82.4	64..	78.3	61.0	44.3	49.0	59.8	44.8	54.3	74.2	47.9	61.2
6(b)	SPECIAL UNDERGRADUATE PROGRAMS PLANNED												
	Ethnic studies	2.5	0.0	1.9	5.9	4.6	4.9	0.9	6.0	2.7	3.4	3.9	3.6
	Women's studies	8.5	5.1	7.7	8.3	7.7	7.9	13.6	22.4	16.8	9.0	8.1	8.6
	Honors program	8.0	9.8	8.4	11.0	9.0	9.6	0.0	0.0	0.0	8.2	8.7	8.4
	Career-related work/study	4.4	17.1	7.3	18.0	13.9	15.0	8.5	4.5	7.0	8.7	14.0	11.3
	Interdepartment/interdisciplinary (e.g., urban, environmental)	17.0	8.5	15.1	15.3	9.1	10.9	2.5	6.0	3.8	15.3	9.0	12.2
	Independent undergraduate study and/or research	4.8	2.1	4.2	2.7	1.3	1.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	3.8	1.4	2.6
	Accelerated degree program (exclude advance placement; include freedom to carry heavier load per term, credit by exam, etc.)	7.3	8.1	7.5	5.4	5.3	5.3	2.5	1.5	2.2	6.3	5.8	6.0
	Study abroad	5.8	6.0	5.8	7.8	2.1	3.7	2.6	0.0	1.6	6.1	2.8	4.4
	Off-campus study in special American subcultures (Indian reservations, Black communities, Appalachian regions, etc.)	1.5	2.6	1.7	5.6	4.3	4.6	2.5	6.0	3.8	2.8	4.2	3.5
	Dual degree with other institutions	3.4	13.7	5.7	13.7	4.7	7.2	2.6	1.5	2.2	6.4	6.3	6.3
	Individualized programs with no specific course requirements (distributional requirements only)	6.6	9.0	7.2	11.6	3.8	6.0	5.9	0.0	3.8	8.0	4.6	6.3
	Individualized programs with no specific course requirements (complete freedom of choice)	2.2	0.0	1.7	4.0	2.5	1.9	0.9	0.0	0.5	2.7	1.9	2.3
	Correspondence and/or other home study	7.0	7.3	7.1	3.0	2.8	2.8	2.5	0.0	1.6	5.5	3.5	4.5
	External degree programs	15.6	7.3	13.8	11.8	4.9	6.8	17.9	4.5	13.0	14.9	5.4	10.2
	Remedial programs	0.0	8.1	1.8	7.5	5.6	6.1	0.9	1.5	1.1	2.3	5.8	4.0
7	UNDERGRADUATE INSTRUCTIONAL FACILITIES AND PROCEDURES												
	Computer-assisted instruction	50.0	13.7	41.9	54.8	48.2	50.1	83.9	72.1	79.6	54.4	43.1	48.8
	Open laboratories (available at student convenience)	82.4	61.1	77.6	80.1	79.4	79.6	84.7	74.6	81.1	82.0	75.7	78.9
	Closed-circuit television	57.6	14.5	47.9	57.5	38.9	44.1	91.5	53.7	77.8	60.7	35.2	48.1
	Student-prepared multi-media instruction	26.5	10.2	22.8	48.9	36.5	40.0	37.6	34.3	36.4	34.0	31.6	32.8
	Independent investigation	68.6	61.1	66.9	91.4	89.0	89.7	90.6	83.8	88.1	77.0	83.5	80.2
	Modularized teaching materials	65.8	33.8	58.6	62.9	35.6	43.2	67.5	50.7	61.4	65.0	36.1	50.8
	Audio or video tape-recorded lectures	84.9	52.6	77.6	76.1	60.3	64.7	88.9	70.1	82.1	82.6	59.4	71.1
	Interdisciplinary projects	67.9	53.4	64.7	76.1	82.6	80.8	86.4	6[illegible]6	86.5	71.9	77.3	74.6
	Interdisciplinary seminars, discussions	56.2	58.1	56.6	78.8	80.1	79.7	83.1	86.6	84.3	65.0	70.6	70.0

APPENDIX A

Institutional Survey of Selected Policies and Practices in Higher Education

INSTITUTIONAL SURVEY OF SELECTED POLICIES AND PRACTICES IN HIGHER EDUCATION

AMERICAN COUNCIL ON EDUCATION
ONE DUPONT CIRCLE
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20036

_____
Name of person completing form

_____
Position

1. For which of the following does your institution grant academic credit toward a degree and/or advanced placement without credit?

	Mark as many as apply in each column	
	Credit Toward Degree	Advanced Placement
College-level work completed in secondary school	____	____
College-level work completed in a nonaccredited institution with accreditation pending	____	____
College-level work completed in an institution whose accreditation has been refused or rescinded	____	____
Education or training in industry or military service	____	____
Work experience in industry or military service	____	____
Successful completion of standardized achievement test (e.g., CLEP or AP)	____	____
Correspondence courses given by your institution	____	____
Correspondence courses given by other institutions	____	____
Course credit by examination without taking the course	____	____
Extension, continuing education, or adult education courses	____	____
Extensive travel and/or overseas living experience	____	____
Remedial courses given by your institution	____	____

2. Which of the following admissions policies are currently practiced by your institution?

	Mark as many as apply
Stated minimum admissions requirements for all first-year, nontransfer students	____
Special selection standards to control the proportion of women students	____
Special selection standards to control the proportion of black students	____
Special selection standards to control the proportion of students from other ethnic groups	____
Special admissions policies to control the proportion of students by geographic origin	____
Special efforts to recruit students from specific ethnic groups	____
Preferential admissions to spouses of matriculated students	____
Preferential admissions to veterans	____
Enrollment in some undergraduate courses by high school students (exclude extension, correspondence, or adult education)	____
Highly individualized admissions decisions based on appraisal of total applicant dossier	____
Open admissions by lottery	____
Open admissions on a first-come, first-served basis	____
Open admissions to any high school graduate	____
Open admissions, other	____

3. How are formal student evaluations of teaching effectiveness handled at your institution?

	Mark as many as apply
Made in all or nearly all departments	____
Made only in some departments	____
Made only in some courses	____
Used in faculty promotions or salary increases	____
Made generally available to campus community	____
Fed back only to individual faculty member	____
Selectively disseminated under administrative control	____

4. Which of the following policies or practices concerning student behavior or student services are in effect at your institution?

	Mark as many as apply
Student publications subject to the *advice* of administration or faculty	____
Student publications subject to the *consent* of administration or faculty	____
Procedures available for the discipline of students by students (e.g., student judiciary committee)	____
Students required to attend religious services	____
Health service permitted to issue contraceptives	____
Special policies for health-related guidance in sexual matters (e.g., abortion referral)	____
Special policies for guidance in drug usage	____
Coed dormitories, with sexes segregated by floors or wings	____
Coed dormitories, with sexes segregated by rooms, same floor or wing	____

5. In what proportion of courses are each of the following grading practices used at your institution?

	In All Courses	In Most Courses	In a Few Courses	In No Courses
Letter grades	____	____	____	____
Numerical grades	____	____	____	____
Pass-fail	____	____	____	____
Satisfactory-unsatisfactory	____	____	____	____
Pass-no record	____	____	____	____
Honors – pass-fail	____	____	____	____
Completed-incomplete	____	____	____	____
Descriptive reports by faculty	____	____	____	____
Faculty evaluation of self-evaluative report by student	____	____	____	____
Student self-grading	____	____	____	____
No record kept of individual course grades	____	____	____	____

Other (specify)

_____

_____

_____

_____

6. Indicate whether each of the following special undergraduate programs is in effect at your institution, has been tried but abandoned, or is planned, and estimate the largest percentage of undergraduates involved in a single academic year since 1965. Unless otherwise indicated, the program need not lead to a specific degree but only provide opportunities for meeting special student needs.

PROGRAM	Mark One in Each Row				Largest Percentage of Undergraduates Involved
	In Effect	Tried but Abandoned	Planned	No Plans	
Ethnic studies	____	____	____	____	_____
Women's studies	____	____	____	____	_____
Honors program	____	____	____	____	_____
Career-related work/study	____	____	____	____	_____
Interdepartment/interdisciplinary (e.g., urban, environmental)	____	____	____	____	_____
Independent undergraduate study and/or research	____	____	____	____	_____
Accelerated degree program (exclude advance placement; include freedom to carry heavier load per term, credit by exam, etc.)	____	____	____	____	_____
Study abroad	____	____	____	____	_____
Off-campus study in special American subcultures (Indian reservations, Black communities, Appalachian regions, etc.)	____	____	____	____	_____
Dual degree with other institutions	____	____	____	____	_____
Individualized programs with no specific course requirements (distributional requirements only)	____	____	____	____	_____
Individualized programs with no specific course requirements (complete freedom of choice)	____	____	____	____	_____
Correspondence and/or other home study	____	____	____	____	_____
External degree programs	____	____	____	____	_____
Remedial programs	____	____	____	____	_____

7. Indicate whether your institution has the following kinds of undergraduate facilities or procedures, and the approximate proportion of students currently exposed to them at some time during their undergraduate studies.

	Mark One in Each Row			
	Do Not Have	Have, Less Than 1/3 Exposed	Have, 1/3–2/3 Exposed	Have, More Than 2/3 Exposed
Computer-assisted instruction	____	____	____	____
Open laboratories (available at student convenience)	____	____	____	____
Closed-circuit television	____	____	____	____
Student-prepared multi-media instruction	____	____	____	____
Independent investigation	____	____	____	____
Modularized teaching materials	____	____	____	____
Audio or video tape-recorded lectures	____	____	____	____
Interdisciplinary projects	____	____	____	____
Interdisciplinary seminars, discussions	____	____	____	____

Other (specify)

_____

_____

_____

_____

Thank you. Please return your completed questionnaire in the self-addressed envelope.

APPENDIX B

A Note on the Precision of the Item Response Percentages

A Note on the Precision of the Item Response Percentages

Item response percentages were estimated by weighting the item response counts in each of the 12 reporting categories, dividing by the number of institutions in that category and multiplying by 100. For a single item in a given category, the variance of such an estimator for single-stage participation and differential weighting by strata involves a rather complex formula and item response proportions within strata. Nevertheless, some idea of the confidence to be placed in the reported percentages may be given.

For the "all institutions" category -- if we ignore stratification but consider the finite population -- an item response at the 50 percent level would have an absolute 95 percent confidence limit of the order of 3 percent. For the smallest reporting category, private universities, the corresponding 95 percent confidence limit is about 9 percent. These are approximate upper limits, because stratification tends to reduce sampling variance and because most item percentages deviate appreciably from 50 percent. With response percentages of 25 percent or of 75 percent, the error is reduced about 40 percent.

The standard error of the difference between the response percentages in two independent categories is the root mean square of the individual standard errors; where one category is part of the other, the standard error of the difference is markedly reduced.

Other Recent Publications by the Staff of the Office of Research
American Council on Education
(ACE)

Astin, A. W. **College Dropouts: A National Profile.** ACE Research Reports, Vol. 7, No. 1. Washington: ACE, 1972.

Astin, A. W. *College-going and Human Development.* **Change, 4** (September 1972), 11, 62.

Astin, A. W. **Predicting Academic Performance in College.** New York: Free Press, 1971.

Astin, A. W., and Lee, C. B. T. **The Invisible Colleges.** Carnegie Commission Series on Higher Education. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1971.

Astin, H. S., Astin, A. W., Bisconti, A. S., and Frankel, H. H. **Higher Education and the Disadvantaged Student.** Washington: Human Service Press, 1972.

Astin, H. S., and Bayer, A. E. *Sex Discrimination in Academe.* **Educational Record, 53** (Spring 1972), 101-118.

Astin, H. S., and Bisconti, A. S. **Career Plans of College Graduates of 1965 and 1970.** Bethlehem, Pa.: College Placement Council, 1973.

Astin, H. S., and Bisconti, A. S. **Trends in Academic and Career Plans of College Freshmen.** Bethlehem, Pa.: College Placement Council, 1972.

Bayer, A. E. *Construction of a Race Item for Survey Research.* **Public Opinion Quarterly, 36** (Winter 1972-73), 592-602.

Bayer, A. E. *Early Marriage in the United States.* **Medical Aspects of Human Sexuality, 7** (August 1973), 208-213.

Bayer, A. E. *The New Student in Black Colleges.* **School Review, 81** (May 1973), 415-26.

Bayer, A. E. **Teaching Faculty in Academe: 1972-73.** ACE Research Reports, Vol. 8, No. 2. Washington: ACE, 1973.

Bayer, A. E., Royer, J. T., and Webb, R. M. **Four Years After College Entry.** ACE Research Reports, Vol. 8, No. 1. Washington: ACE, 1973.

Bayer, A. E. **The Black College Freshman: Characteristics and Recent Trends.** ACE Research Reports, Vol. 7, No. 3. Washington: ACE, 1972.

Bayer, A. E. *College Impact on Marriage.* **Journal of Marriage and the Family, 34** (November 1972), 600-609.

Bisconti, A. S., and Astin, H. S. **Undergraduate and Graduate Study in Scientific Fields.** ACE Research Reports, Vol. 8, No. 2. Washington: ACE, 1973.

Boruch, R. F., and Creager, J. A. **Measurement Error in Social and Educational Survey Research.** ACE Research Reports, Vol. 7, No. 2. Washington: ACE, 1972.

Creager, J. A. *Academic Achievement and Institutional Environments: Two Research Strategies.* **Journal of Experimental Education, 40** (Winter, 1971), 9-23.

Creager, J. A. *Futurism in Higher Education.* **Change, 4** (Winter 1972), 8, 62.

Creager, J. A. **The American Graduate Student: A Normative Description.** ACE Research Reports, Vol. 6, No. 5. Washington: ACE, 1971.

Drew, D. E., and Astin, A. W. *Undergraduate Aspirations: A Test of Several Theories.* **The American Journal of Sociology, 77** (May 1972), 1151-64.

Drew, D. E., and Creager, J. A. **The Vietnam-Era Veteran Enters College.** ACE Research Reports, Vol. 7, No. 4. Washington: ACE, 1972.

El-Khawas, E. H., and Astin, H. S. *Current Enrollment Characteristics of Graduate Students in Psychology.* **American Psychologist, 27** (May 1972), 457-61.

Higher Education Panel Survey. *Enrollment of Junior Year Students (1971 and 1972).* Spring, 1973. Mimeographed.

Higher Education Panel Survey. *Student Participation on Institutional Governing Boards.* Fall, 1972. Mimeographed.

Holmstrom, E. I. *Changing Sex Roles in a Developing Country.* **Journal of Marriage and the Family, 35** (August 1973), 546-53.

Molm, L. D., and Astin, A. W. *Some Personal Characteristics and Attitude Changes of Student Protesters.* **Journal of College Student Personnel, 4** (May 1973), 32-39.

Staff of the Office of Research. **The American Freshman: National Norms for Fall 1972.** ACE Research Reports, Vol. 7, No. 5. Washington: ACE, 1972.